

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ROLAND C. ANDERSON,	:
	:
Plaintiff,	:
	:
v.	: Civil Action No. 05-877-JJF
	:
GENERAL MOTORS,	:
	:
Defendants.	:

ORDER

WHEREAS, Plaintiff, who proceeds pro se, filed a Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law (D.I. 44) on 6/28/07, a Motion To Dismiss His Order for A Deposition (D.I. 56) on 9/25/07, a Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery (D.I. 64) on 10/24/07, and a Motion for Extension of Time to take Deposition (D.I. 67) on 10/30/07;

WHEREAS, Defendant filed a Motion for Summary Judgment (D.I. 79) on 12/7/2007;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment relates solely to the Motion for Reconsideration that was denied by the Court (D.I. 46) on 8/16/07;

WHEREAS, by his Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff contends that he was given inadequate notice of his deposition; however, parties rescheduled Plaintiff's deposition to a mutually convenient time;

WHEREAS, by his identical Motions for Extension of Time,

Plaintiff seeks additional time to depose Terry Tyndall ("Tyndall"), an employee of Defendant who was unavailable because of medical leave. As Plaintiff has not presented any argument regarding Tyndall's relevance and has not rebutted Defendant's assertion that Tyndall's sole involvement in this matter is signing for receipt of Plaintiff's complaint, the Court concludes that Plaintiff has failed to establish Tyndall's relevance to Plaintiff's remaining claims;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff correctly notes that Defendant mistakenly placed the case number of a previously consolidated case on some attachments to its Motion for Summary Judgment. Defendant placed the correct case number on its actual Motion, however, and the Court finds that no prejudice to Plaintiff resulted from Defendant's erroneous captioning. Nonetheless, the Court will extend additional time to Plaintiff to respond to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment;

NOW THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment (D.I. 44) is DENIED as moot;
2. Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss His Order for a Deposition (D.I. 56) is DENIED as moot;
3. Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery (D.I. 64) and Motion for Extension of Time to take Deposition (D.I. 67) are DENIED;

4. Plaintiff is granted ten days from the date of this order to respond to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (D.I. 79);
5. Plaintiff's pretrial conference, scheduled for March 6, 2008, is CANCELLED.

February 21, 2008


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE